

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/735,899

Applicant(s)

JOURDAN ET AL.

Examiner

Barry J. O'Brien

Art Unit

2183

All Participants:

(1) Barry J. O'Brien.

(2) Robert Hails.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 June 2004

Time: 11am EST

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1, 6, 11, 18, 23, and 30

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted the Applicant to discuss claim amendments that would put the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner noted that claim 1 appeared to have been overlooked when the present amendment was filed, as all of the other independent claims were amended to clearly overcome the prior art of record, and claim 1 was indicated to have been amended similarly, but no amendment was made. The Applicant said that this was a glitch in the filing of the claim, and the claim should have been amended to include the limitation that similar independent claim 23 was amended to include. Secondly, the Examiner requested that the independent claims be amended to include something about the manner in which the instruction segments were built, as the broad limitation "building an instruction segment" could read upon any group of instructions or segment, and would not limit the claim to the instruction "traces" that the claimed invention relates to. The Examiner suggested amending the claims along the lines of "building an instruction segment according to program flow" so as to define that the segments the claim limitations relate to have been built to be traces, not just blocks of instructions. The Examiner pointed out that these amendments should not narrow the scope of the claims, but just more clearly define the nature of the invention claimed. The Applicant agreed to proposed amendments, and authorized the Examiner to make the changes via Examiner's Amendment..

5

C